## WARNING

# IMPORTANT NOTICE DO NOT DETACH

#### SUPERFUND CONFIDENTIAL BUSINESS INFORMATION

All or a portion of the attached document is claimed to be confidential business information by the submitter pursuant to CERCLA, as amended, § 104. Unless and until EPA makes a determination that the document is not confidential business information, it must be treated as such.

Any person handling or using the attached document in any way is responsible for preventing unauthorized disclosure while in his or her possession. §1905 of title 18 of the United States Code and CERCLA, as amended, §104(e)(7)(B) provide penalties for disclosure of confidential business information. They include criminal penalties and adverse personnel actions.

The document may not be disclosed further or copied by you except as authorized by The Superfund CBI Manual. If you have any questions concerning the appropriate handling of this document, please contact the attorney assigned to this case or the Office of Regional Counsel, EPA, Region 9.

## Allen Matkins

Allen Matkins Leck Gamble Maltory & Natsis LLP
Attorneys at Law

Three Embarcadero Center, 12th Floor | San Francisco, CA 94111-4074 Telephone: 415.837.1515 | Facsimile: 415.837.1516

www.ailenmatkins.com

Robert D. Wvatt

E-mail: rwyatt@allenmatkins.com

Direct Dial: 415.273.7420 File Number: B0815-006/SF723127.01

### Via Messenger

September 28, 2007

Mr. Michael Massey Office of Regional Counsel Environmental Protection Agency EPA Region 9, ORC-3 75 Hawthorne Street San Francisco, CA 94105

Re: Price Pfister 13500 Paxton Street, Pacoima, California

Dear Mr. Massey:

In accordance with our telephone discussion of September 26, 2007, I am enclosing certain technical reports regarding environmental documentation at the former Price Pfister property located at 13500 Paxton Street in Pacoima, California ("Property"). As you know, this Property is the subject of U.S.E.P.A. Region 9's CERCLA Sec. 104(e) request for information dated September 11, 2007 as received by Price Pfister on September 12, 2007.

As you will note, the number of documents forwarded for review by Region 9 staff is considerably larger than I proposed during our telephone discussion. The reason for the larger submittal is to include all essential documents for review in order to avoid unnecessary back and forth between the parties regarding the desire for additional documents and to facilitate Region 9's comprehensive review of salient information.

As we discussed, these technical documents are being submitted in Price Pfister's expectation that after a thorough review EPA Region 9 staff will conclude that past operations on the Property have no bearing on the San Fernando Valley Area I site, North Hollywood Operable Unite ("NHOU" or "the Site") and do not threaten to do so.

As we also discussed, these documents are being forwarded with an understanding that Region 9 will forebear on an interim basis on other requests for information set forth in the September 11 104(e) request, pending review of the forwarded information. In the event of the desire, if any, for review of other requested information, please contact me so that the parties can work out a reasonable time-line for production. The scope of the 104(e) request is extraordinarily

Allen Matkins Leck Gamble Mallory & Natsis LLP Attorneys at Law

Mr. Michael Massey September 28, 2007

Page 2

broad, and in pursuing this approach it could well be that Price Pfister can save tens of thousands of dollars in staff and photocopying charges, and Region 9 staff can focus on only that which is relevant.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Very truly yours,

Robert D. Wyatt

RDW:dwk Enclosures

cc: David A. Bacharowski